

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the outstanding Office Action dated January 27, 2006.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lewellen et al (US 2,682,781). Nevertheless, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn in light of the following reasons.

The test for determining anticipation under Section 102(b) requires that the same or virtually identical device or invention has been previously disclosed in a single prior structure, patent or description. The guide part 47 of the Lewellen et al reference is just equivalent to the guide cylinder 731 of the present invention, and the collar 51 of the Lewellen et al reference is an evitable member for keeping the compression ring 53. However, the limiting ring A of the present invention is an additional member for restricting the moving distance of the guide cylinder 731 of the passive disk 73 thereby limiting the speed of a vehicle. The limiting ring can be easily removed when no speed limit is required. As a consequence, it is obvious that the Lewellen et al reference fails to disclose, teach or suggest a limiting ring A which can be easily removed when no speed limit is required, as claimed in new claim 3 and does not disclose all features of the claimed invention. Since the claim 3 defines novel structure that produces new and unexpected results, applicant submits that such claim is clearly patentable.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition of allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Signature

Leong C. Lei

Registration No. 50402

April 18, 2006